Exhibit 5

ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., a California corporation, Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants, v. FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR CORP., a Delaware corporation, Defendant and Counterclaimant. AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.										
2 AMY M. SPICER (State Bar No. 188399) MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 3 One Market, Spear Street Tower San Francisco, CA 94105-1126 4 Tel: 415.442.1000 Fax: 415.442.1000 Fax: 415.442.1000 6 Fax: 415.442.1000 Fax: 415.442.1000 Fax: 415.442.1000 Fax: 415.442.1000 Fax: 415.442.1000 Fax: 415.442.1001 7 ANDREW J. WU (State Bar No. 214442) DAVID V. SANKER (State Bar No. 251260) MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKTUS LLP 2 Palo Alto Square 3 3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700 Palo Alto, CA 94306-2122 Tel: 650.843.4000 Fax: 650.843.400 Fax: 650.843.400 Fax: 650.843.400 Fax: 650.843.400 Fax: 65	1	DANIEL JOHNSON, JR., State Bar No. 57-	409							
3 One Market, Spear Street Tower San Francisco, CA 94105-1126 Tel: 415.442.1000 Fax: 415.442.1001 dijoinson@morganlewis.com bschuman@morganlewis.com aspicer@morganlewis.com ANDREW J. WU (State Bar No. 251260) MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 2 Palo Alto Square 3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700 Palo Alto, CA 94306-2122 Tel: 650.843.4000 Fax: 650.843.4001 awu@morganlewis.com dsanker@morganlewis.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, LTD. ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., a California corporation; and ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., a California corporation, Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants, V. FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR CORP., a Delaware corporation, Defendant and Counterclaimant. AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.	2	AMY M. SPICER (State Bar No. 188399)								
Tel: 415.442.1000 Fax: 415.442.1001 djjohnson@morganlewis.com bschuman@morganlewis.com ANDREW J. WU (State Bar No. 214442) DAVID V. SANKER (State Bar No. 251260) MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 2 Palo Alto Square 3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700 Palo Alto, CA 94306-2122 Tel: 650.843.4000 Fax: 650.843.4001 awu@morganlewis.com dsanker@morganlewis.com dsanker@morganlewis.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, LTD. ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, LTD., a Bermuda corporation; and ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., a California corporation, Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants, v. Case No. C 07-2638 JSW (Consolidated with Case No. C-07-2664 AOS'S RESPONSES AND OBJECTI TO FAIRCHILD'S SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION PARCHALLONG SEMICONDUCTOR CORP., a Delaware corporation, Defendant and Counterclaimant. AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.	3	One Market, Spear Street Tower								
dijohnson@morganlewis.com bschuman@morganlewis.com ANDREW J. WU (State Bar No. 214442) DAVID V. SANKER (State Bar No. 251260) MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 2 Palo Alto Square 3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700 Palo Alto, CA 94306-2122 Tel: 650.843.4000 Fax: 650.843.4001 awu@morganlewis.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, LTD. ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., a California corporation; and ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., a California corporation, Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants, V. PAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR CORP., a Delaware corporation, Defendant and Counterclaimant. AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.	4	Tel: 415.442.1000								
ANDREW J. WU (State Bar No. 214442) DAVID V. SANKER (State Bar No. 251260) MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 2 Palo Alto Square 3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700 Palo Alto, CA 94306-2122 Tel: 650,843,4000 Fax: 650,843,4001 awu@morganlewis.com dsanker@morganlewis.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., a Bermuda corporation; and ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., a California corporation, Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants, V. FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR CORP., a Delaware corporation, Defendant and Counterclaimant. AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.	5									
DAVID V. SANKÈR (State Bar No. 251260) MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 2 Palo Alto Square 3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700 Palo Alto, CA 94306-2122 Tel: 650.843.4000 Fax: 650.843.4001 awu@morganlewis.com dsanker@morganlewis.com 4Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, LTD. ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, ITD., a Bermuda corporation, and ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., a California corporation, Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants, v. FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR CORP., a Delaware corporation, Defendant and Counterclaimant. AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.	6	aspicer@morganlewis.com								
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 2 Palo Alto Square 3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700 Palo Alto, CA 94306-2122 Tel: 650.843.4000 Fax: 650.843.4001 awu@morganlewis.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, LTD. ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, LTD., a Bermuda corporation; and ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., a California corporation, Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants, V. FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR CORP., a Delaware corporation, Defendant and Counterclaimant. AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.	7		n							
9 3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700 Palo Alto, CA 94306-2122 Tel: 650.843.4000 Fax: 650.843.4001 awu@morganlewis.com dsanker@morganlewis.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, LTD. ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, LTD., a Bermuda corporation; and ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., a California corporation, Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants, v. FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR CORP., a Delaware corporation, Defendant and Counterclaimant. AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.	8	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP								
Tel: 650.843.4000 Fax: 650.843.4001 awu@morganlewis.com dsanker@morganlewis.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, LTD. ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, ITD., a Bermuda corporation; and ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., a California corporation, Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants, v. FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR CORP., a Delaware corporation, Defendant and Counterclaimant. AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.	9	3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700	,							
awu@morganlewis.com dsanker@morganlewis.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, LTD. ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, LTD., a Bermuda corporation; and ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., a California corporation, Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants, V. FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR CORP., a Delaware corporation, Defendant and Counterclaimant. AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.	10	Tel: 650.843.4000								
Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, LTD. ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, LTD., a Bermuda corporation; and ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., a California corporation, Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants, V. FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR CORP., a Delaware corporation, Defendant and Counterclaimant. AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.	11	awu@morganlewis.com	•							
ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, LTD. ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, LTD., a Bermuda corporation; and ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., a California corporation, Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants, V. FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR CORP., a Delaware corporation, Defendant and Counterclaimant. AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.	12									
14 15 16 17 18 19 ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, LTD., a Bermuda corporation, and ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., a California corporation, Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants, v. 21 22 23 24 25 26 AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT COURT Case No. C 07-2638 JSW (Consolidated with Case No. C-07-2664 TO FAIRCHILD'S SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION) Case No. C 07-2638 JSW (Consolidated with Case No. C-07-2664 TO FAIRCHILD'S SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION)	13	ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, LTD.								
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, LTD., a Bermuda corporation; and ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., a California corporation, Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants, v. FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR CORP., a Delaware corporation, Defendant and Counterclaimant. AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.	14									
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, LTD., a Bermuda corporation; and ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., a California corporation, Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants, v. FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR CORP., a Delaware corporation, Defendant and Counterclaimant. AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.	15									
ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, LTD., a Bermuda corporation; and ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., a California corporation, Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants, v. FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR CORP., a Delaware corporation, Defendant and Counterclaimant. AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.	16	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA								
ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, LTD., a Bermuda corporation; and ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., a California corporation, Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants, v. FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR CORP., a Delaware corporation, Defendant and Counterclaimant. AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.	17	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION								
LTD., a Bermuda corporation; and ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., a California corporation, Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants, v. FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR CORP., a Delaware corporation, Defendant and Counterclaimant. AOS'S RESPONSES AND OBJECTI TO FAIRCHILD'S SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.	18	AT DUA & OMECA SEMICONDUCTOR								
20 INC., a California corporation, 21 Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants, 22 v. 23 FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR CORP., a Delaware corporation, 24 Defendant and Counterclaimant. 25 AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS. 27	19	LTD., a Bermuda corporation; and	Case No. C 07-2638 JSW (Consolidated with Case No. C-07-2664 JSW)							
Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants, v. FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR CORP., a Delaware corporation, Defendant and Counterclaimant. AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.	20	INC., a California corporation,								
22 v. 23 FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR CORP., a Delaware corporation, 24 Defendant and Counterclaimant. 25 AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.	21	Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants,	TO FAIRCHILD'S SECOND SET OF							
CORP., a Delaware corporation, Defendant and Counterclaimant. AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.	22	v.	REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION							
Defendant and Counterclaimant. AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS. 27	23									
25 26 AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS. 27	24	· .								
27	25	Dorondant and Counterclannant.								
	26	AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.								
28	27									
) n '	28 5 &									

Morgan, Lewis & BOCKIUS LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Pursuant to Rule 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants Alpha & Omega Semiconductor, Ltd. and Alpha & Omega Semiconductor, Inc. (collectively "AOS") hereby respond to the Second Set of Requests for Production ("Requests") propounded by Defendant and Counterclaimant Fairchild Semiconductor Corp. ("Fairchild") in Case No. 07-02638 JSW, averring as follows:

Document 178-5

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

- 1. AOS generally objects to the Requests to the extent they seek documents and things subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or work-product doctrine, or any other privilege or protection afforded by law. Any inadvertent production of any document or thing shall not constitute a waiver of any privileges of AOS, and AOS reserves its rights to demand and obtain the return of any such document or thing, and all copies thereof. AOS further objects to the Requests to the extent they require AOS to search for and reveal privileged information, documents, and things from its and its attorneys' files. AOS will schedule withheld documents and things on a privilege log pursuant to the agreement of the parties, which is currently being negotiated.
- AOS generally objects to the Requests to the extent they seek to impose upon AOS 2. obligations different from, or in addition to, those obligations imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Civil Local Rules or the Patent Local Rules of the Northern District of California, or any Orders of the Court. AOS' responses shall be controlled by the requirements imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Federal Rules of Evidence, the applicable Local Rules, and Orders of the Court.
- 3. AOS objects to Fairchild's definitions of "AOS," "you," and "your" as vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome to the extent they seek to make the Requests apply to, and seek information, documents, or things from, persons or entities other than, or beyond the control of, Alpha & Omega Semiconductor, Ltd. or Alpha & Omega Semiconductor, Inc. Subject to its general and specific objections, AOS shall base its answers to the Requests solely on information, documents, or things that are in the custody, possession, or control of Alpha & Omega Semiconductor, Ltd. or Alpha & Omega Semiconductor, Inc.

1	
2	
3	i
4	
5	
6	,
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	-
23	
24	
25	
26	
_	

- 4. AOS objects to Fairchild's definition of "Accused AOS Device" as overly broad. As Fairchild has defined the term, it purports to encompass each and every trench MOSFET or IGBT product that AOS has ever made, used, offered for sale, sold, or imported. AOS will treat the term "Accused AOS Device" as including the fourteen devices cited in Fairchild's Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Preliminary Infringement Contentions, namely AO4410, AO4413A, AO4422, AO4468, AO6402, AO6405, AO4704, AO4812, AO4912, AO4914, AOD438, AOD414, AOL1412, and AOL1414, or as otherwise agreed in the course of the parties' ongoing discussions regarding "representative parts." Likewise, AOS's production of documents and things regarding its commercial products will conform to the agreement, if any, between the parties regarding "representative parts."
- 5. AOS objects to Fairchild's definitions of "refer or relate to" and "referring or relating to" as vague, ambiguous, unintelligible, and unduly burdensome and oppressive to the extent that it purports to impose any obligations on AOS beyond the requirements of the applicable federal rules of civil procedure.
- 6. AOS objects to Fairchild's definition of "document" as being overly broad, and unduly burdensome and oppressive to the extent that the phrase "or to which you have, have had or can obtain access" seeks information that is not in the possession, custody, or control of AOS.
- 7. AOS objects to Fairchild's definition of "prior art" as overly broad, vague, ambiguous, and unduly burdensome.
- 8. AOS objects to Fairchild's Instruction No. 2 as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks to impose obligations different from, or in addition to, the obligations imposed by Rule 26(b)(5) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Accordingly, AOS shall comply with Rule 26(b)(5) with respect to any documents requested to be produced that are withheld on the grounds that they are subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or work-product doctrine, or any other privilege or protection afforded by law. Furthermore, as stated in General Objection No. 1, AOS will schedule withheld documents and things on a privilege log pursuant to the agreement of the parties, which is currently being negotiated.

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20 .	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	*** *** **
26	
27	
	đ

	9.	AOS objects to Fairchild's Instruction No. 3 (and any request including a similar
instruc	ction) as	unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks to limit the manner in which documents
may be	e produc	ced. Accordingly, AOS will comply with Rule 34(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil
Ртосед	lure, wh	ich permits the production documents as they are kept in the ordinary course of
busine	SS.	

- AOS objects to Fairchild's Instruction No. 4 as overly broad and unduly 10. burdensome to the extent it imposes no temporal limitations on the documents sought by these Requests.
- AOS objects to Fairchild's Instruction No. 5 as overly broad and unduly 11. burdensome to the extent that is seeks to impose an obligation to supplement beyond that specified in Rule 26(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Accordingly, AOS will comply with Rule 26(e), which requires supplementation of disclosures under specific circumstances.

RESPONSES

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 33:

All documents and things that relate to the conception of each of the inventions claimed in the '630 patent.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 33:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks documents and things protected by the attorney-client privilege or the work-product doctrine. AOS objects further that this request calls for a legal conclusion. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce nonprivileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 34:

All documents and things that relate to the actual reduction to practice of each of the inventions claimed in the '630 patent.

I-PA/3677182.2

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 34:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further that this request calls for a legal conclusion. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request because it is not limited to the asserted claims of the '630 patent. AOS objects further that the request is overly broad in seeking documents and things for any reduction to practice other than the first reduction to practice. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 35:

All documents and things that relate to the best mode for practicing each of the inventions claimed in the '630 patent known to the inventors at the time of filing of the patent application for each such invention.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 35:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further that this request calls for a legal conclusion. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks documents and things protected by the attorney-client privilege or the work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request because it is not limited to the asserted claims of the '630 patent. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 36:

All documents and things that relate to the contribution made to the inventions claimed in the '630 patent by each of the inventors identified on the face of each of the '630 patent.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 36:

1

2

7 8 9

10

11

12 13 14

17

15

16

18 19 20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

10RGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW AN FRANCISCO

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks documents and things protected by the attorney-client privilege or the work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further that the phrase "relate to the contribution" is vague and overbroad. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 37:

All documents and things that relate to the preparation, filing or prosecution of any application, including any reissue application, request for re-examination, continuation application, continuation-in-part application and divisional application, for each of the '630 patent, including, without limitation, the complete file histories, all communications with the Patent and Trademark Office, any and all drafts of such communications, and any and all correspondence relating to or referring to the preparation or prosecution of any such applications.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 37:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks documents and things protected by the attorney-client privilege or the work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further that the phrase "for each of the '630 patent" is vague and ambiguous. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 38:

All documents and things that are prior art to the '630 patent.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 38:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further that this

request calls for a legal conclusion. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 39:

All documents and things provided by any third party to AOS that purport to identify prior art to the '630 patent.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 39:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further that this request calls for a legal conclusion. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 40:

All documents and things that relate to any devices embodying any of the claims of the '630 patent that were sold or offered for sale prior to the filing of a patent application for the respective invention.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 40:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks documents and things protected by the attorney-client privilege or the work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to the phrase "filing of a patent application for the respective invention" as being vague, ambiguous, and unintelligible. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad and unduly burdensome because it is not limited to the asserted claims. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or

2

3 4

5 6

7 8

9

10 11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 26

27

10RGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP TTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO

will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 41:

All documents and things that relate or refer to any Fairchild product allegedly covered by any claims of the '630 patent.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 41:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks documents and things protected by the attorney-client privilege or the work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request to the extent it seeks documents and things outside the possession, custody, or control of AOS. AOS objects further to this request as being vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome, harassing, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence because it seeks all documents and things that "relate or refer" to Fairchild products, regardless of the content of those documents or things. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce nonprivileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 42:

All documents and things that relate to any products embodying any claims of the '630 patent that were sold or offered for sale at any point in time.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 42:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks documents and things protected by the attorney-client privilege or the work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence because it seeks all documents and things that "relate to" any products. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad and unduly burdensome because it is not

3

5 6

7 . 8

9

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

2324

25

26

27

28
MORGAN, LEWIS &
BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN FRANCISCO

limited in time and not limited to the asserted claims of the '630 patent. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents relating to any product upon which AOS intends to rely that are in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 43:

All documents that relate to the structure, operation, function or performance of any products embodying any claims of the '630 patent.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 43:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks documents and things protected by the attorney-client privilege or the work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence because it seeks all documents and things that "relate to" any products. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad and unduly burdensome because it is not limited in time and not limited to the asserted claims of the '630 patent. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 44:

All external and internal specifications, design specifications and data sheets for any products embodying any claims of the '630 patent.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 44:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks documents and things protected by the attorney-client privilege or the work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad and unduly

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

burdensome because it is not limited in time and not limited to the asserted claims of the '630 patent. AOS objects further to this request because the phrase "external and internal specifications" is vague and ambiguous. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 45:

All documents that relate to the specifications of any products embodying any claims of the '630 patent.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 45:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks documents and things protected by the attorney-client privilege or the work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad and unduly burdensome because it is not limited to the asserted claims of the '630 patent. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it seeks all documents "related" to product specifications. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 46:

All documents and things, including without limitation, letters, memos, e-mails or notes of phone conversations or personal meetings that relate to the notification to any third party of infringement or potential infringement of the '630 patent.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 46:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP WAL TA EVANDOTE SAN FRANCISCO

Case 3:07-cv-02638-JSW

3

4 5

6

7

9

8

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

24

23

2526

27

28
MORGAN, LEWIS &
BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN FRANCISCO

calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to the extent this request purports to seek documents covered by the attorney-client privilege or the work-product doctrine. AOS objects further that the request is vague as to "third party" and overly broad to the extent it includes any entity other than Fairchild or AOS. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 47:

All documents and things, including without limitation, letters, memos, e-mails or notes of phone conversations or personal meetings that relate to the provision of notice to Fairchild of the existence of the '630 patent, including, without limitation, notices of infringement and threats of suit.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 47:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further that this request seeks documents and information in Fairchild's actual or constructive possession. AOS objects further to the extent this request purports to seek documents covered by the attorney-client privilege or the work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further that the phrase "relate to the provision of notice" is vague and ambiguous. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 48:

Separately segregated as to each of the AOS Asserted Patents, all documents and things that discuss, evidence, record, refer to, relate to, or form the basis of AOS's allegation that Fairchild has infringed one or more claims of the '630 patent.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 48:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this

4 5

6

7

9

10

11.

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

23

22

2425

26

27

28
MORGAN, LEWIS &
BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN FRANCISCO

request as being overly broad, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks documents and things protected by the attorney-client privilege or the work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request as being premature and calling for expert analysis. AOS objects further to this request as being vague, ambiguous, and unintelligible because it requests documents "segregated as to each of the AOS Asserted Patents," but seeks documents that show infringement of "one or more claims of the '630 patent." Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO 49:

All documents and things that relate to how and/or when AOS first became aware of the Fairchild products or methods alleged to infringe any or all of the '630 patent.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO 49:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to the extent this request purports to seek documents covered by the attorney-client privilege or the work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 50:

All documents and things that relate to any analysis of any of Fairchild's products or methods for the purpose of determining whether such products or methods infringed any or all of the '630 patent.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 50:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks documents and things protected by the attorney-client privilege or the work-product doctrine. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 51:

All documents that relate to any civil action, arbitration proceeding or other legal or administrative proceeding (including any interference, opposition, reissue or re-examination proceeding in the U.S. Patent and Trademark office), filed in the United States where the infringement, scope, interpretation, misuse, priority, validity and/or enforceability of the '630 patent is or was an issue, including, without limitation, all pleadings, motions, briefs, declarations, affidavits, expert witness disclosures and reports, discovery requests and responses, documents produced by any party or non-party, transcripts of trials and hearings, transcripts of depositions (and exhibits thereto), trial and/or hearing exhibits, settlement agreements, prior art to any of the '630 patent and correspondence between AOS and any other party or any non-party or any expert witness regarding any aspect of the litigation, including settlement.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 51:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to the extent this request purports to seek documents covered by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further that the phrase "prior art to any of the '630 patent" is vague, ambiguous, and unintelligible. AOS objects further to the extent that it calls for expert analysis or legal conclusions. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 52:

All documents that relate to any and all communications between AOS and Fairchild

pertaining to the '630 patent.

Case 3:07-cv-02638-JSW

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO

RESP	ONSE	TO	REQ	UEST	FOR	PRO	DUC	CTIC	n n	1 O .	52:
							•				

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to the extent this request purports to seek documents covered by the attorney-client privilege or the work-product doctrine. AOS objects further that this request seeks documents and information in Fairchild's actual or constructive possession. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further that the request is vague and overly broad with respect to the phrase "documents that relate to any and all communications". Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce nonprivileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 53:

All documents that relate to company directories, organizational charts and similar documents sufficient to show names, locations (geographic or by department or division) and reporting lines of all AOS officers, directors or employees who may have had knowledge concerning AOS's design, development, manufacture, production, marketing, distribution and/or sale of any AOS power transistor products, including any products that embody the claims of the '630 patent.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 53:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, vague, ambiguous, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS will produce non-privileged documents sufficient to identify the officers, directors, or employees of AOS who have knowledge of the technical design and operation of AOS's power transistor products.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 54:

All documents and things that you may use to support your claims or defenses.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 54:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is unlimited in time and scope. AOS objects further to this request as premature and calling for expert analysis. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks materials protected by the attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request as being vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 55:

All documents and things on which you intend to rely at trial or at any pre-trial hearing.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 55:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is unlimited in time and scope. AOS objects further to this request as being premature and calling for expert analysis. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks materials protected by the attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request as being vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request as being duplicative, cumulative, unduly burdensome, oppressive, and harassing to the extent it seeks documents requested in other requests, including Request For Production No. 54. Subject to and without waiving its

4

3

5 6

7

9

10

8

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

MORGAN, LEWIS A BOCKIUS LLP TTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO

objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 56:

All documents supporting or relating to any contention by AOS that it does not infringe the Fairchild Asserted Patents, including without limitation non-infringement studies, noninfringement reports, and any search, opinion, study, investigation, or analysis conducted by or on behalf of you to determine whether you infringe any AOS Asserted Patents.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 56:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further that this request is premature and improper to the extent it seeks discovery inconsistent with the requirements of Patent L.R. 3-8. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is unlimited in time and scope. AOS objects further to this request as premature and calling for expert analysis. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks materials protected by the attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request as being vague, ambiguous, and unintelligible because it seeks documents regarding whether AOS infringes its own patents. AOS objects further that this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 57:

All documents and things relating to the alleged invalidity or unenforceability of the Fairchild Asserted Patents, including without limitation any search, opinion, study, report, investigation, or analysis conducted by or on behalf of you to determine whether any Fairchild Asserted Patents are invalid or unenforceable.

1

2

Case 3:07-cv-02638-JSW

7 8

9

6

10 11 12

13 14

15 16

> 17 18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28 Morgan, Lewis & **BOCKIUS LLP** ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further that the request is vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase "relating to the alleged invalidity or unenforceability of the Fairchild Asserted Patents." AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is unlimited in time and scope. AOS objects further to this request as premature, calling for expert analysis, and calling for legal conclusions. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks materials protected by the attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request as being vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 58:

All documents and things relating to the level of knowledge, schooling, experience, expertise or relevant technical skill of a person having ordinary skill in the art relating to any invention disclosed, described or claimed in the AOS Asserted Patents or Fairchild Asserted Patents (as this phrase is used in 35 U.S.C. § 103).

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 58:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further that the request is vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase "all documents and things sufficient to show." AOS objects further to this request as calling for legal conclusions and expert opinion testimony that will be the subject of expert discovery. AOS objects further to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

this request to the extent that it seeks materials protected by the attorney-client privilege or workproduct doctrine. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 59:

All documents and things sufficient to show the name, number, line, series, family and any other designation used by you to refer to each Accused AOS Device.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 59:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 60:

A fully functional sample of each Accused AOS Device.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 60:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overbroad, unduly burdensome, oppressive, and not reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it will produce a mutually agreed-upon sample of its products.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 61:

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW AN FRANCISCO

4 5

7

6

9

8

10 11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

iorgan, Lewis & BOCKIUS LLP TTORNEYS AT LAW

AN FRANCISCO

All documents and things describing any analyses of the Accused AOS devices, including but not limited to Secondary Ion Mass Spectrometry (SMS), Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM), or Transmission Electron Microscopy (TEM).

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 61:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request as premature and calling for expert analysis. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks materials protected by the attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 62:

Documents sufficient to determine the function and/or performance characteristics of any layer, region, interface, connection, and/or bond, the spreading resistance, conductivity type, threshold voltage, turn-on resistance, depletion width, channel length, breakdown voltage, breakdown profile, and punch-through tolerance of the Accused AOS devices.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 62:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS further objects to the request as being vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase "layer, region, interface, connection, and/or bond, the spreading resistance, conductivity type, threshold voltage, turn-on resistance, depletion width, channel length, breakdown voltage, breakdown

profile, and punch-through tolerance." AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request as premature and calling for expert analysis. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks materials protected by the attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents regarding a mutually agreed-upon sample of its accused products.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 63:

All documents and things concerning the advantages or purported advantages of any Accused AOS Device, including without limitation statements related to cost savings, quality, reliability, features, functions, power consumption, voltage requirements, or other purported advantages of any Accused AOS Device.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 63:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request as premature and calling for expert analysis. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks materials protected by the attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request to the extent it calls for speculation. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents regarding a mutually agreed-upon sample of its accused products.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 64:

Product specifications for any Accused AOS Device, including without limitation documents and things sufficient to show their dimensions (including thickness of each layer) and

28
MORGAN, LEWIS &
BOCKTUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN FRANCISCO

MORGAN, LEWIS &
BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN FRANCISCO

components, materials from which they are made (including concentrations of each element), the electrical properties of the materials, the mechanical properties of the materials, the thermal properties of the materials, and a complete set of design, engineering, and/or manufacturing drawings of any Accused AOS Device.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 64:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks materials protected by the attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents regarding a mutually agreed-upon sample of its accused products.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 65:

All articles, publications, papers, reports, or presentations authored in whole or in part by a current or former employee of AOS concerning any Accused AOS Device.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 65:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS further objects to this request as being vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase "concerning any Accused AOS Device." AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request to the extent it seeks confidential business information and AOS trade secrets. Subject to and without waiving its

3

4

5 6

7 8

9

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

21

20

2223

2425

26 27

28 Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

SAN FRANCISCO

objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 66:

All documents and things concerning your first design of any Accused AOS Device, including but not limited to documents sufficient to identify all persons having knowledge of your first design of the device, any drawings, specifications, recipes, other descriptions of the device, and/or any prototype of the device.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 66:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request as not reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 67:

All documents and things relating to competitive analyses, comparisons, reports, reverse engineering, or differences in structure, function, operation, performance, or the advantages or disadvantages of any Accused AOS Device.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 67:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS

22

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

further objects to this request as being vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase "the advantages or disadvantages of any Accused AOS Device." AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks materials protected by the attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request to the extent it seeks confidential business information and AOS trade secrets. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 68:

Documents and things sufficient to identify any entity that performs any part of the manufacture of any Accused AOS Devices, including any entity that acts as a foundry or wafer fab, and documents and things sufficient to identify the role that entity plays in the manufacture of any Accused AOS Devices.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 68:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS directs Fairchild to AOS's response to Interrogatory #8.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 69:

All documents and things relating to any work performed by any person or entity other than AOS or its employees relating to the research, design, development, or manufacture of any Accused AOS Device.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 69:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this

Case 3:07-cv-02638-JSW

5

7 8

10

11

9

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO

request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request to the extent it seeks information confidential to third parties. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 70:

All communications between you, on the one hand, and the named inventors of the Fairchild Asserted Patents, on the other hand, relating to any Accused AOS Device or any Fairchild Asserted Patents.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 70:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request as being overbroad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because "communications ... relating to any Fairchild Asserted Patents or AOS Asserted Patents" is not limited to relevant subject matter. AOS objects further to the extent this request purports to seek documents covered by the attorney-client privilege and/or work-product doctrine. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 71:

1

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

2324

2526

27

MORGAN, LEWIS &
BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN FRANCISCO

All documents and things relating to communications between you, on the one hand, and any other person or entity (including actual or potential customers), on the other hand, relating to any Fairchild Asserted Patents or AOS Asserted Patents.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 71:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request to the extent it seeks documents and things subject to the attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request as being overbroad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because "communications ... relating to any Fairchild Asserted Patents or AOS Asserted Patents" is not limited to relevant subject matter. AOS objects further to this request to the extent it seeks information confidential to third parties. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 72:

All documents and things relating to any products that compete with any Accused AOS Device in the relevant market, including without limitation competitive analyses and product comparisons.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 72:

Pursuant to the parties' stipulation, AOS reserves its right to object and respond to this request at a later time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 73:

Documents sufficient to show the earliest date when you became aware of each of the Fairchild Asserted Patents and the actions taken by you in response to such awareness.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 73:

3

Case 3:07-cv-02638-JSW

4 5

6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

22

23

21

24 25

26

27

Pursuant to the parties' stipulation, AOS reserves its right to object and respond to this request at a later time with respect to the earliest date when AOS became aware of the Fairchild Asserted Patents.

With respect to actions taken by AOS in response to awareness of the Fairchild Asserted Patents, AOS responds as follows: AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not réasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks materials protected by the attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request to the extent it seeks confidential business information. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 74:

All documents and things relating to knowledge of the Fairchild Asserted Patents by any individual involved in the research, design, development, engineering and testing of any Accused AOS Device.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 74:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further

Case 3:07-cv-02638-JSW

6

9

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25

26 27

MORGAN, LEWIS & **BOCKIUS LLP** ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO

that the phrase "relating to knowledge" makes this request overly broad and unduly burdensome. AOS objects further to this request because it seeks documents and things outside the possession. custody, or control of AOS. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 75:

All documents and things relating to your document retention policies.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 75:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request to the extent it seeks documents and things subject to the attorneyclient privilege or work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad and unduly burdensome in requesting irrelevant information not reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence. AOS objects further that this request is overly broad and unduly burdensome because it seeks "all" documents and things, including cumulative, duplicative, and redundant items. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 76:

Documents sufficient to identify the location where each Accused AOS Device was researched, designed, tested, made, sold or offered for sale by or on behalf of you.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 76:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS

Case 3:07-cv-02638-JSW

8

9

7

10

12

11

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW

SAN FRANCISCO

objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further that the locations sought in this request are not relevant to the claims or defenses in this action. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 77:

All documents constituting or relating to business plans, strategic plans, consultant reports or strategy reviews concerning the design, manufacture, marketing or sale of any Accused AOS Device.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 77:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request to the extent it seeks confidential business information and AOS trade secrets. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search. Pursuant to the parties' stipulation, AOS reserves its right to object further and respond to this request at a later time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 78:

Documents sufficient to identify each of your U.S. and foreign customers for any Accused AOS Device.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 78:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent

that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 79:

All documents reflecting communications regarding Fairchild, any of the AOS Asserted Patents, Fairchild Asserted Patents or this litigation, with each customer, potential customer, buyer, client, consumer or vendor for all the Accused AOS Devices.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 79:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, and ambiguous, particularly with respect to the phrase "documents reflecting communications." AOS objects further that the request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 80:

All documents evidencing your knowledge or lack of knowledge concerning the downstream sales or uses of any Accused AOS Device, including without limitation your knowledge or lack of knowledge that any Accused Fairchild Devices are made, used, sold, offered for sale, or imported in(to) the United States.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 80:

28
MORGAN, LEWIS &
BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN FRANCISCO

28
MORGAN, LEWIS &
BOCKJUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN FRANCISCO

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unintelligible. AOS objects further to this request as being vague, ambiguous, and unintelligible because it initially refers to "Accused AOS Devices," and later refers to including "Accused Fairchild Devices." AOS objects further that the request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 81:

All documents and things relating to any patents (whether expired or in force) or patent applications (whether issued, pending, or abandoned) related to the AOS Asserted Patents, including any continuations, continuations-in-part, divisionals, reissues, reexaminations, or counterparts related thereto, and any related foreign patents and patent applications, including any underlying patent applications.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 81:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS further objects to this request as being vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase "underlying patent applications." AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 82:

All notebooks, diaries, files, appointment calendars, research reports, or workbooks generated or maintained by any inventor of any of the Fairchild Asserted Patents or AOS

Asserted Patents during the time period beginning with the earliest possible date of conception of the patented invention and ending with the issuance of the patent.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 82:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request to the extent it seeks documents and things subject to the attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome and vague. AOS objects further that the request is neither limited to relevant evidence nor reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence. AOS objects further to the extent it seeks personal items, or items under the control of Fairchild, and thus not in the possession, custody, or control of AOS. AOS objects further that the request is ambiguous because it refers to inventors of the Fairchild and AOS patents, but subsequently refers to "the earliest possible date of conception of the patented invention and ending with the issuance of the patent." Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 83:

All documents and things prepared, reviewed, or edited by an inventor of any AOS

Asserted Patent relating to any invention disclosed, described, or claimed in the AOS Asserted

Patent.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 83:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent

28
MORGAN, LEWIS &
BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN FRANCISCO

that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad and unduly burdensome because it is not limited to the asserted claims of the AOS Asserted Patents and not limited in time. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 84:

Documents reflecting the last-known residence and employment of each inventor of any AOS Asserted Patent.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 84:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request to the extent it seeks documents and things subject to the attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to the request to the extent it seeks information protected by common law, constitutional and/or statutory rights of privacy. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 85:

All drawings, prototypes, notes, notebooks, workbooks, project reports, correspondence, memoranda, reports, test results, and all other documents and things relating to, or that were

_

3

5 6

8

9

7

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

23

22

2425

26

27

28
MORGAN, LEWIS &
BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN FRANCISCO

created, used, or referred to in connection with, the design, research, development, or testing of any invention claimed, disclosed, or described in any AOS Asserted Patent.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 85:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS object further to this request as being overly broad and harassing because it seeks irrelevant items and is not limited to the asserted claims of the AOS Asserted Patents. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 86:

All documents and things regarding the breakdown characteristics or performance of trench MOSFET devices, including without limitation breakdown initiation.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 86:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence because it seeks documents and things without limitation as to authorship, possession, relationship to the patents in suit, or relationship to any accused devices. AOS objects further to this request as seeking documents and things that are equally available to Fairchild. AOS objects further that this request is vague and ambiguous because it appears to request AOS to collect and provide to Fairchild all documents and things in

1

3 4

5

6

7

8 9

11 12

10

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

> 25 26

27

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW

SAN FRANCISCO

the entire trench MOSFET industry. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents regarding the breakdown characteristics of a mutually agreed-upon sampling of Accused AOS Devices.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 87:

All documents and things regarding the breakdown characteristics, breakdown performance, and/or resistance to "punchthrough" of any devices that AOS contends practice any claim of the AOS Asserted Patents, including without limitation any analysis or simulation of the breakdown initiation in such devices.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 87:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to the extent this request purports to seek document covered by the attorney-client privilege and/or work-product doctrine. AOS objects further that this request is premature and calls for expert analysis, particularly with regard to the terms "breakdown characteristics," "breakdown performance," and "punchthrough." AOS objects further that this request is overly broad and harassing because it is not limited to the asserted claims of the AOS Asserted Patents. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce nonprivileged responsive documents that are in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 88:

All documents and things regarding the doping of any "heavy body" and any "doped well" in a MOSFET device, including without limitation the existence or creation of any "abrupt junction" at any interface between such a "heavy body" and such a "doped well."

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 88:

28
MORGAN, LEWIS &
BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further that this request calls for legal conclusions. AOS objects further that the request is vague and ambiguous and AOS is unable to respond further until after the claim construction phase of the case.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 89:

All documents and things referring to or defining an "abrupt junction."

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 89:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to the extent this request purports to seek documents covered by the attorney-client privilege and/or the work-product doctrine. AOS objects further that this request is unduly burdensome. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents referring to the term "abrupt junction" and in the possession, custody, or control of AOS to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 90:

All documents and things relating to your first commercial embodiment of each and every AOS Asserted Patent.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 90:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS

I-PA/3677182.2

AOS objects further that this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence to the extent it seeks documents and things identifying the first sale of products that were not sold or offered for sale until after the patent applications leading to the AOS Asserted Patents were filed. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents that are in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 91:

All draft or final press releases relating to the AOS Asserted Patents, Fairchild Asserted Patents, this lawsuit, or any product relating to any of the foregoing.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 91:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS further objects to this request as being vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase "any product relating to any of the foregoing." AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request to the extent it seeks documents or communications protected by the attorney-client privilege or the work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to the request to the extent it seeks press releases by Fairchild or other third parties. AOS objects further that the request is overly broad, ambiguous, and harassing because it is not limited to press releases by AOS. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 92:

3 4

5

6

7 8

10

9

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28 Morgan, Lewis & BOCKIUS LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO

All documents reflecting any assignment, sale, acquisition, license or transfer of any rights relating to any AOS Asserted Patent or any related patent or application.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 92:

Pursuant to the parties' stipulation, AOS reserves its right to object and respond to this request at a later time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 93:

All documents relating to your contemplated or actual commercial exploitation of any invention disclosed, described, or claimed by any AOS Asserted Patent, including without limitation feasibility studies, marketing plans, marketing forecasts, estimates or projections of market share, periodic research and development reports, management reports or other periodic reports, advertisements, promotional brochures, product literature, catalogs, trade show exhibits or displays, technical brochures, specifications, price lists, contracts, purchase orders, papers published or presented, and customer lists (including sales to all end-users, distributors and retailers).

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 93:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad with respect to "contemplated products." AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks confidential business information or AOS trade secrets. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing to the extent that it seeks information about products that do not embody asserted claims of the AOS Asserted Patents. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 94:

3

4

5

7

8

6

9 10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

Documents sufficient to determine the structure, function, or operation of all products made, used, sold, offered for sale, licensed, offered for license, or transferred by or for AOS that you contend embody or use any invention disclosed, described, or claimed in any AOS Asserted Patent.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 94:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it is cumulative and duplicative of Request For Production Nos. 10 and 42. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks information about products that do not embody asserted claims of the AOS Asserted Patents. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 95:

Documents sufficient to identify all persons who participated in the design or development of all products made, used, sold, offered for sale, licensed, offered for license, or transferred by or for AOS that you contend embodies or uses any invention disclosed, described, or claimed in any AOS Asserted Patent.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 95:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS

38

28
MORGAN, LEWIS &
BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN FRANCISCO

objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS further objects to this request as being vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase "participated in the design or development." AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks information about people who participated in the design or development of products that do not embody asserted claims of the AOS Asserted Patents. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 96:

All documents and things relating to commercial exploitation by others of any invention disclosed, described, or claimed in any AOS Asserted Patent.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 96:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous (specifically with respect to the term "others"), and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it seeks information about products that do not embody asserted claims of the AOS Asserted Patents. AOS objects further to this request to the extent it seeks information about third parties. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 97:

All documents and things relating to any current or former employee of Fairchild.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 97:

7

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

19

18

20 21

22 23

24

25 26

27

MORGAN. LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS further objects to this request as being vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase "relating to any current or former employee." AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, and ambiguous. AOS objects further to this request as not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to the extent this request seeks documents covered by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine and/or other doctrine. AOS objects further to the request to the extent it seeks information protected by common law, constitutional and/or statutory rights of privacy. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search, except that AOS will not produce any employee personnel files.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 98:

Documents sufficient to identify all persons involved with prosecuting the AOS Asserted Patents, related patents, or related applications.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 98:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request to the extent it seeks documents and things subject to the attorneyclient privilege or work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad and unduly burdensome because it is not limited to individuals with relevant involvement or limited to the AOS asserted patents. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

2223

24

25

26 27

28
MORGAN, LEWIS &
BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN FRANCISCO

either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 99:

All documents constituting or reflecting any search, investigation, evaluation, or opinion as to the novelty, patentability, validity, enforceability, or scope of any AOS Asserted Patent, or any related patent or application

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 99:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further this request because it seeks materials protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or the work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it seeks information regarding the novelty, patentability, validity, enforceability, and scope of unasserted claims, unasserted patents, and unassertable patent applications. AOS objects further to this request to the extent it calls for expert analysis and legal conclusions. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 100:

All patents and other publications that were reviewed or received by anyone involved with prosecuting any AOS Asserted Patent, related patent, or related application, during the period of such involvement.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 100:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent

28
MORGAN, LEWIS &
BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN FRANCISCO

that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request to the extent it seeks documents and things subject to the attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request as being vague and ambiguous as to what patents or publications the request is seeking. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence because the request seeks patents and publications that are not being asserted and are not even related to the asserted patents. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 101:

All documents and things evidencing or relating to making, using, testing, or selling any invention disclosed, described, or claimed in any AOS Asserted Patent, including without limitation documents and things relating to the first uses (whether or not public) of such inventions.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 101:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request to the extent it seeks documents and things subject to the attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is not limited to the asserted claims of the AOS Asserted Patents. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or

control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

2

3 4

5

6 7

8 9

10 11

13 14

12

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

Morgan, Lewis & **BOCKIUS LLP** ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 102:

All documents and things evidencing or relating to (a) public use, (b) on sale activity, (c) commercial exploitation, and (d) experimental use (as these phrases are used in the application of 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)), by each inventor, you, or any other person, of any invention disclosed, described, or claimed in any AOS Asserted Patent.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 102:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request as being unduly burdensome and harassing to the extent it duplicates or is cumulative of Request For Production Nos. 10, 42, and 101. AOS objects further to this request to the extent it is duplicative or cumulative of Interrogatory Nos. 5 and 6. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is not limited to the asserted claims of the AOS Asserted Patents. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing to the extent it seeks documents and things of "others". AOS objects further to this request to the extent it calls for expert analysis or legal conclusions. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO 103:

All documents and things constituting, evidencing or relating to patents, publications, written descriptions, or other prior art references of which you are aware, relating to any invention claimed in any of the AOS Asserted Patents.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO 103:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this

1 2 request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent 3 that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS 4 5 objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to 6 7 this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is not limited to 8 the asserted claims of the AOS Asserted Patents and not limited in time. AOS objects further to 9 this request to the extent it calls for expert analysis or legal conclusions. Subject to and without 10 waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 104:

located through a reasonable search.

All publications, including without limitation books, book excerpts, articles in technical or trade publications, conference papers or presentations, or internal technical memoranda, authored in whole or in part by any inventor of any AOS Asserted Patent, regarding breakdown performance or breakdown characteristics of MOSFETs.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 104:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence because it seeks documents and things without limitation as to possession, relationship to the patents in suit, or relationship to any accused devices. AOS objects further that this request is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is not limited to power MOSFETs with a trench design. AOS objects further to this request as seeking documents and things that are equally available to Fairchild. AOS

AORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP TTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO

7

8 9

11

12

10

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

23

22

24

25

26 27

MORGAN, LEWIS & Bockius LLP TTORNEYS AT LAW

objects further to this request as being vague and ambiguous. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents concerning trench design power MOSFETs that are in the possession, custody, or control of AOS to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 105:

All publications, articles, conference papers, or technical or marketing presentations relating to any commercial embodiment of the AOS Asserted Patents.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 105:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS object further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is substantially cumulative and duplicative of Request For Production Nos. 10 and 42. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is not limited to the asserted claims of the AOS Asserted Patents. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents that are in the possession, custody, or control of AOS to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 106:

All documents and things evidencing or relating to any problems solved by any commercial embodiment or invention disclosed, described, or claimed in any AOS Asserted Patent.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 106:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent

1

Case 3:07-cv-02638-JSW

6 7

8 9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

IORGAN, LEWIS **BOCKIUS LLP** TTORNEYS AT LAW AN FRANCISCO

that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS object further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is substantially cumulative and duplicative of Request For Production Nos. 10, 42, and 105. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is not limited to the asserted claims of the AOS Asserted Patents. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents that are in the possession, custody, or control of AOS to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 107:

All documents and things evidencing or relating to failures by persons to solve any problems solved by any commercial embodiment or invention disclosed, described, or claimed in any AOS Asserted Patent.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 107:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS object further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is substantially cumulative and duplicative of Request For Production Nos. 10, 42, and 105. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is not limited to the asserted claims of the AOS Asserted Patents. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents that are in the possession, custody, or control of AOS to the extent they exist and can

Page 48 of 56

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28 Morgan, Lewis & BOCKIUS LLP

be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 108:

All documents and things evidencing or relating to whether any commercial embodiment or invention disclosed, described, or claimed in any AOS Asserted Patent, has been commercially successful.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 108:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS object further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is substantially cumulative and duplicative of Request For Production Nos. 10, 42, and 105. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is not limited to the asserted claims of the AOS Asserted Patents. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents that are in the possession, custody, or control of AOS to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 109:

All documents and things evidencing or relating to whether any commercial embodiment or invention disclosed, described, or claimed in any AOS Asserted Patent, has been copied by others.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 109:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS

28
MORGAN, LEWIS &
BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN FRANCISCO

objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS object further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is substantially cumulative and duplicative of Request For Production Nos. 10, 42, and 105. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is not limited to the asserted claims of the AOS Asserted Patents. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents that are in the possession, custody, or control of AOS to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 110:

All documents and things evidencing or relating to whether any commercial embodiment or invention disclosed, described, or claimed in any AOS Asserted Patent, has been praised by anyone other than its inventors or you.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 110:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS object further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is substantially cumulative and duplicative of Request For Production Nos. 10, 42, and 105. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is not limited to the asserted claims of the AOS Asserted Patents. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents that are in the possession, custody, or control of AOS to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 111:

1

3 4

> 5 6

8 9

7

11

10

12 13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

24

23

25 26

27

28 Morgan, Lewis & **BOCKIUS LLP** ATTORNEYS AT LAW AN FRANCISCO

All documents and things evidencing or relating to whether any commercial embodiment or invention disclosed, described, or claimed in any AOS Asserted Patent has departed from accepted principles in the industry.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 111:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS object further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is substantially cumulative and duplicative of Request For Production Nos. 10, 42, and 105. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is not limited to the asserted claims of the AOS Asserted Patents. AOS objects further that the phrase "departed from accepted principles in the industry" is vague and ambiguous. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents that are in the possession, custody, or control of AOS to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 112:

All documents and things evidencing or relating to whether any commercial embodiment or invention disclosed, described, or claimed in any AOS Asserted Patent has been recognized by the industry or received industry acclaim.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 112:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and

not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS object further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is substantially cumulative and duplicative of Request For Production Nos. 10, 42, and 105. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is not limited to the asserted claims of the AOS Asserted Patents. AOS objects further that the phrase "recognized by the industry or received industry acclaim" is vague and ambiguous. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents that are in the possession, custody, or control of AOS to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 113:

All documents and things evidencing or relating to any mode contemplated by any inventor for carrying out any invention disclosed, described, or claimed in any AOS Asserted Patent, from a period starting with the earliest possible conception of the invention and ending six months after the patent application was filed.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 113:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is not limited to the asserted claims of the AOS Asserted Patents. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, harassing, and not reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence to the extent that it seeks contemplated modes of operation at any time other than the filing of the patent applications. AOS objects further to this request to the extent that it is cumulative and duplicative of Request For Production No. 35. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive

28
MORGAN, LEWIS &
BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN FRANCISCO

3

4 5

7

8

6

9 10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24 25

26

27

MORGAN, LEWIS BOCKIUS LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO

documents that are in the possession, custody, or control of AOS to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 114:

All documents reflecting any statement, assertion, or claim by anyone relating to the patentability, validity, enforceability, or scope of any claim of any AOS Asserted Patent, including without limitation any document that states or implies that any AOS Asserted Patent, or any claim thereof, is, or may be, invalid or unenforceable.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 114:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing because it is not limited to the asserted claims of the AOS Asserted Patents. AOS objects further to this request as being vague and ambiguous by seeking documents that "imply" patent claims are invalid or unenforceable. AOS objects further to the extent this request purports to seek documents covered by the attorney-client privilege and/or work-product doctrine. Subject to and without waiving its objections, AOS responds that it either already has or will produce non-privileged responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control to the extent they exist and can be located through a reasonable search.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 115:

A fully functional sample of each commercial embodiment of each and every AOS Asserted Patent.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 115:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent

. 7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 Morgan, Lewis &

BOCKIUS LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS further objects to this request as being vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase "each commercial embodiment." AOS objects further that this request is substantially cumulative to Request For Production No. 60. AOS objects further to the extent this request seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine or other applicable privilege or doctrine. AOS objects further on the ground that this request is vague and ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive and seeks information not relevant to the subject matter of the pending action or claims or defenses of any party, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 116:

Documents sufficient to identify, such as by manufacturer, model, and part number, all automated information systems at AOS, both past and present, including e-mail and document management systems, including without limitation any such e-mail or document management systems that would apply to documents concerning the design, manufacture, production, marketing, or sales of Accused AOS Devices or documents concerning the AOS Asserted Patents or the Fairchild Asserted Patents.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 116:

AOS incorporates by this reference its General Objections. AOS objects further to this request in that it is substantially identical to a request that AOS served on Fairchild; to the extent that Fairchild has objected to AOS's request and that Fairchild's objections are given weight by the Court or agreement of the parties, AOS incorporates those same objections herein. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. AOS objects further to this request as being overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing to the extent that it is not limited to automated information systems containing relevant information. AOS objects further to this request as being vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome because the phrase "automated information system," unless limited, could encompass every computer workstation or

28
MORGAN, LEWIS &
BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN FRANCISCO

1-PA/3677182.2

	· ·		
1 2 3 4 5	BRETT M. SCHUMAN State Bar No. 1892 AMY M. SPICER (State Bar No. 188399) MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP One Market, Spear Street Tower San Francisco, CA 94105-1126 Tel: 415.442.1000 Fax: 415.442.1001 djjohnson@morganlewis.com bschuman@morganlewis.com	409) 47)	
7 8 9 10	DAVID V. SANKER (State Bar No. 251260 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 2 Palo Alto Square 3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700 Palo Alto, CA 94306-2122 Tel: 650.843.4000		
11	Fax: 650.843.4001 awu@morganlewis.com dsanker@morganlewis.com		
13 14	Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Counterdefendar ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, I ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, I	LTD.	
15	UNITED STAT	ES DISTRICT COURT	
16	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
17	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
18			
19	ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, LTD., a Bermuda corporation; and		
20	ALPHA & OMEGA SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., a California corporation,	(Consolidated with Case No. C-07-02664 JSW)	
21	Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants,	PROOF OF SERVICE	
22	ν.	•	
23	FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR CORP., a Delaware corporation,		
24	Defendant and Counterclaimant.		
25	AND DELATED COLDITION OF AN IC		
26	AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.		
27			
MORGAN, LEWIS & BUCKIUS LLP MICHONIS AT LAW NEW YORK	1-PA/3680457.1	PROOF OF SERVICE	
		C07-02638 JSW (CONSOLIDATED WITH C-07-02664 JSW)	

]

2

3 4

5

7

6

9

8

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP TIORNEYS AT LAW

PROOF OF SERVICE

Alpha & Omega Semiconductor v. Fairchild Semiconductor USND-C07-02638 JSW (Consolidated with C-07-02664 JSW)

I am a resident of the State of California and over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action; my business address is 2 Palo Alto Square, 3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700, Palo Alto, CA 94306.

On December 12, 2007, I served the within document(s) on the parties listed below:

AOS'S RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO FAIRCHILD'S SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION

×	I caused the envelope(s) with the document(s) listed above to be delivered by U.S. Mail, to the addressee(s) noted below.
---	---

Addressee	Service	
Eric Jacobs	U.S. Mail	
Igor Shoiket		
Matthew Hulse		
Leonard Augustine		
Priya Sreenivasan	i	
TOWNSEND & TOWNSEND		
2 Embarcadero Center, 8th Floor		
San Francisco, CA 94111		
Tel: 415.576.0200		
Fax: 415.576.0300	·	

I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

Executed on December 12, 2007, at Palo Alto, California.

I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of California, that the above is true and correct.

David Sanker